

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
7 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
8

9 IVERA MEDICAL CORPORATION,  
10 Plaintiff,

11 vs.

12 HOSPIRA, INC.,  
13 Defendant.  
14


CASE NO. 11-CV-1246-H-JMA  
CASE NO. 12-CV-1582-H-JMA

**ORDER CONSOLIDATING  
CASES**

15 On February 7, 2013, the Court ordered the parties to show cause why these two  
16 actions should not be consolidated pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a)(2).  
17 (Case No. 12-cv-1582, Doc. No. 27.) On February 25, 2013, Plaintiff Ivera Medical  
18 Corporation filed a response in support of consolidating the two actions. (*Id.*, Doc. No.  
19 28.) On March 6, 2013, Defendant Hospira, Inc., filed a response stating that it does  
20 not oppose consolidation. (*Id.*, Doc. No. 30.) Thus, neither party opposes consolidation  
21 and neither party disputes that these two actions share a common question of law or  
22 fact. As such, the Court orders that these actions be consolidated. Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a).  
23 Case No. 11-cv-1246 will be the lead case.

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25 Dated: March 7, 2013

26   
27 MARILYN L. HUFF, District Judge  
28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT